



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXIII, I.

WHOLE NO. 89.

I.—PROBLEMS IN GREEK SYNTAX.¹

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Some nine years ago I conceived the plan of collecting my own studies in Greek syntax, together with those that had been set on foot at my suggestion, and of publishing the whole under the title of 'Problems in Greek Syntax.' While I found little to retract, there was not a little to add by way of further illustration and

¹ In an address delivered in December, 1899, on the 'Place of Philology,' President Wheeler of the University of California made public lamentation over 'the exaggerated attention paid to syntax in American class-rooms of Greek and Latin' as constituting 'the severest menace to the usefulness and therefore to the continuance of classical study'. This warning was duly echoed by the editor of the *Classical Review*, himself a grammarian; but as no names were mentioned and as, of late years, other American scholars have flooded the philological world, and, for aught I know, their class-rooms, with a fertilizing Nile of syntactical studies, I might have failed to take the lesson to myself. True, I have worked at syntax and if I have not 'turned up the field of Aphrodite or the Charites' with my grammatical ploughshare, as Pindar would say, I have, at least, like Tennyson's Northern Farmer (Old Style) 'stubb'd' or helped to stub 'Thurnaby waäste.' But in order that I might not comfort myself with the thought that I had done some decent work and that at any rate I was not the greatest sinner in the land, the editor of an English educational journal proceeded to point President Wheeler's moral and to reinforce Professor Postgate's comment by holding up Professor Gildersleeve as one who had exercised a deleterious influence on cis-Atlantic classical studies. What a sad return for the patience with which I have kept my arrows within my quiver for all these years! μή τις ἐτι πρόφρων ἀγανὸς καὶ

explanation, and the volume would have bulked largely enough to arrest the attention of the scholarly world. For no *obiter dicta*, no pregnant aphorisms, will avail nowadays. If the chips are not sent in with the table, the table cannot be accepted as a specimen of joiner's work. To this collection I intended to prefix an introductory essay which should set forth my point of view and indicate some lines of research that could, in my judgment, be profitably pursued. In the preparation of this essay I made use of no works of reference, in the hope that I should thereby gain in readableness, a hope which proclaims me to be still in the bonds of literary iniquity.¹ No true grammarian has any right to be readable. Being called on unexpectedly to say something at the Chicago meeting of the American Philological Association, in 1893, I availed myself of the opportunity to air some of the notions embodied in the essay, so that a few of the phrases here used may be familiar to some of my readers and in the time that has elapsed some of the points made have been more fully developed, now in the Journal, now in special treatises by my students, and haply by others. On reviewing this performance I cannot help thinking that while it was well to abandon the projected volume of syntactical studies, the introductory matter

ἤπιος ἔστω. But the publication of this series of papers will show how little I am disturbed by these criticisms, which I mention by way of encouragement to my fellow-syntacticians and I resume my lucubrations in cheerful mood. ὅσα δρῶν εὐφραίνε θυμόν, says Bakchylides. And should I ever need heartening, I will read and re-read what Weil, who is no syntactician à outrance, has written on the subject of Greek Syntax in the Journal des Savants for May, 1901. '<Le> don < de sentir et de faire sentir les nuances les plus délicates >, nécessaire à tout grammairien, l'est particulièrement à celui qui entreprend d' écrire une syntaxe grecque. Rien ne ressemble moins à un code : elle obéit, il est vrai, à des lois que l'on peut dégager, mais dès qu'on essaye de formuler ces lois, elle résiste, elle réclame sa liberté : cette liberté n'est cependant pas la licence ; si elle semble enfreindre la lettre de la loi, c'est pour mieux se conformer à son esprit. C'est que la langue grecque, produit naturel d'un peuple admirablement doué, n' a pas connu pendant des siècles le joug étroit des grammairiens de profession ; instrument d'une merveilleuse souplesse, elle s' accommoda au caractère des genres littéraires, au génie des poètes, des orateurs, des écrivains qui savaient en jouer, capable de rendre les plus fines nuances du sentiment et de la pensée. Mobile et variée à l'infini, tout en restant la même, cette langue fait, par son apparente indiscipline, le désespoir des grammairiens rigides et les délices des esprits qui savent la goûter.'

¹ The notes are all afterthoughts.

may not have lost all its interest. As editor of the American Journal of Philology I have imposed on myself a self-denying ordinance, and when after the first ten years, the supply of copy for the department of original communications became ample, I withdrew into the narrow confines of 'Brief Mention.' But in the volumes that are yet to be issued under my management I expect to try the patience of my subscribers more seriously than I have done heretofore, and with this number I make the beginning.

It is a droll fate that a man whose ambition for all his early years was to be a poet, or, failing that, to be a man of letters, should have his name, so far as he has a name at all, associated with that branch of linguistic study which is abhorrent to so many finely constituted souls. But when I renounced literature as a profession and betook myself to teaching, I found that there was no escape from grammar, if I was to be honest in my calling. Every teacher must spend much time in the study of grammar, if he is to do his duty, for no teacher finds any grammar satisfactory at all points. Each author has a grammar of his own, written or unwritten. Each student has a grammar of his own, has his ways of adjusting the phenomena to his range of vision or *vice versa*, less frequently *vice versa*. As soon as one begins to handle the language practically, to set exercises, to correct exercises, even in the elementary form of retroversion, problems are sure to arise. The rules will not work; the facts will not fit into the scheme; analysis will not yield synthesis; the prepositions and the cases are rebellious; and the moods and tenses will not reproduce themselves, when the test of retranslation is applied. It is in the very beginnings that the troubles show themselves. In Greek verse composition, in Latin verse composition, the problems are not so obtrusive. They are veiled in phraseology, and hence in the mosaic of Greek and Latin verses there are much fewer errors in grammar than might be expected from the very slender knowledge that the artists display when they come to write on grammatical subjects. One is reminded of the way in which Aristophanes mimics epic syntax. True, in almost all modern productions of this kind the eye of the student of historical syntax will detect absurd lapses, absurd anachronisms, absurd violations of sphere;¹ but if we are

¹ So in running my eye over a volume of Greek verses to which I owe some pleasant half-hours, I notice *εἰσιν* in Attic verse as a present; 2nd pers. pres.

to lay righteousness to the line and judgment to the plummet, there will be no enjoyment of any artificial poetry, there will be no pleasure in the study of the Alexandrians or in the contemplation of the Greek Anthology. There is such a thing as being too sensitive. One scholar tells us that Victor Hugo lost somewhat of his French touch by his residence in Jersey. Another that Lysias had lived too long in the West to be considered a safe guide in the matter of Atticism.¹ Let us not be too hard to please; let us not break the bruised 'Reeds of Cam' nor pluck to pieces the paper 'Garland of the Severn,' nor stop our ears to the 'Whispers of the Hesperides.' The advantage that comes to the individual from the close study of diction and versification is undeniable, and the cheap fun that has been made of Latin and Greek verse-wrights ought not to lead scholars who have not been brought up under English influences to sneer at exercises that have a positive value. What English scholar would be guilty of such quantities as German 'Gelehrte' inflict on a long-suffering public?² What sterner demand for practice in verse-making could be made than has been made of late by Wilamowitz—one of the most brilliant scholars of our day? No translator 'is he that cannot translate both ways.'³ But the advantage is an individual

subj. with neg. as an imperative, which, by the way, may be found in Hug's Symposium 179, B 5 (μή λέγῃς); the articular infinitive used with the same freedom as in prose; πρὶν with pres. inf. as a normal thing and as many δέῃ σ' δπως's as are to be found in the whole range of Greek literature.

¹ A. J. P. IV 88.

² 'Quanta tum forem felicitate beatus' is an hexameter pilloried in the Cl.R. 1892, p. 452, and the following note copied from the Nation of March 17, 1892, may be of interest. 'I had just re-read,' says "An Old Contributor," 'Ritschl's merciless review of Madvig's "Adversaria" in which the Danish scholar's false quantities are not spared (Opusc. iii. 164), when I opened a volume of "Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft Wilhelm von Christ zum sechzigsten Geburtstage dargebracht" and began with the "Carmen Salutatorium" by J. Menrad, who is known as the author of a creditable piece of work on contraction and synizesis in Homer. Where his master, Christ, studied I do not know; but many a sexagenarian scholar of Ritschl would rather have died at fifty-nine than have lived on to be congratulated in a poem that begins with the portentous blunder *Iam lux ter vicies*. To be sure, *vicies* is no worse than Madvig's *nâsse* and *pâletur*, and Latin verses are an anachronism; but the anachronist should possess and use a *Gradus ad Parnassum* under penalty of having his verses considered *perparvi valoris*, as a German Latinist wrote the other day.'

³ A. J. P. XIII 517.

advantage and belongs to a range of studies that the world rightly or wrongly has agreed to discard. *Versus et cetera ludicra pono*. The teacher's main business is to account for the phenomena of the authors read in class; and composition is tolerated chiefly for the exactness it gives in the command of the facts.¹ It is just here, just in the daily explanation of the texts, just in the correction of exercises that almost every thoughtful teacher finds difficulties more or less abundant, according to his vision, according to his temperament. And my first studies in Greek syntax were of this practical kind. Many of the formulae reached during twenty years of teaching were deposited in the notes of my edition of Justin Martyr, which I have elsewhere compared to a hunter's *cache*, and much that I have written since is little more than a justification of rules and principles established or verified in the course of my class-work. Established or verified, I say. To the eye of the specialist the novelties are few indeed; and what I have fancied was my own may have been nothing but reminiscence. Questions of originality and priority concern me little. He would be a poor teacher who should not hit upon a happy phrase, an apt formula now and then. What I am desirous of setting forth is the point of view, which, apart from the moral obligations of the teacher, has given grammatical research so large a place in my professional life. But of this point of view, this creed, this ideal, I have written at some length in my essay on 'Grammar and Aesthetics'; and I will not repeat what I have set down there. Suffice it to say, the study of Greek syntax would always have imposed itself on me as a duty, but take away its spiritual, its artistic content, and it would cease to be for me the meadow of asphodel it has been for years. It would lack the purple glow that lights up the arid plain of grammar until it becomes the Elysian fields of art. It is the moral, the aesthetic side of the study that has interested me from the beginning, and it is the glimpses of the moral and the aesthetic side that have made me less forlorn. The man in Bunyan was so busy with his muck rake that he did not see the crown of glory that was over his head. The muck rake is sometimes the only instrument by which the crown of glory can be reached.

Fortunately for the student of the historical syntax of Greek that wishes to redeem his department from the charge of that

¹ See an article entitled: Quelques mots sur l'histoire du thème grec, *Revue Universitaire*, 15 mars, 1893, p. 281.

statistical dulness into which we have been drifting of late, aesthetic syntax is an organic part of his work, an inevitable part of his work. For history we must have chronology and the various departments of Greek literature develop themselves chronologically, so that one important factor in the account is secure. But in the history of literature, chronology is not everything. The sphere must be considered, and the more one studies, the more one becomes convinced of the importance of the literary range. Each department of literature has a history of its own; each author has a stylistic syntax of his own; and these are the problems that have always interested me most, that have made of a passionate lover of literature a dispassionate dissector of language. But the anatomist and the physiologist have their loves despite scalpel and microscope, and I trust that the grammarian has not wholly killed the literary man in me. Indeed so far from that, it is the literary man in me that seeks the aid of the grammarian at every turn. Grammatical figure cannot be divorced from rhetorical figure. Music is older than rhetoric, rhetoric is older than grammar. What were the men who used the language doing in the long ages before writing checked growth? All through those aeons artistic work was going forward, and not all unconsciously. From the grammatical side euphony is movement in the line of least resistance. From the artistic side it is delight in the play of sound; and the artistic definition has imposed itself on grammar. What is analogy from the linguistic side, is love of symmetry from the artistic side. Language as art, is the art of arts, and outdoes in its perfection painting and sculpture, but art works under law and it is largely the function of grammar to determine the law. We cannot escape grammar when we study style; and he did good service who entitled his book a 'Grammar of Ornament.' We cannot escape grammar when we study style. We cannot escape style when we study grammar. Bald truism, perhaps. But unless I am mistaken few appreciate how close the connexion is, how often the interpretation of a point of grammar turns upon the knowledge of an author's style. Perhaps I may be pardoned for giving one or two familiar illustrations from elementary grammar.

THE SENTENCE.

Syntax begins with the sentence—*si dis placet*. Of course, in genetic syntax one does not deal with such old-fashioned things

as 'sentence,' 'subject' and 'predicate.' Genetic syntax has to do with 'current' and 'poles,' but for the outer world it may be safe to say that syntax begins with the sentence. To be sure, the most simple form of the sentence, the finite verb with its implied subject, does not admit of syntax. As soon, however, as the subject is expressed, the problem begins. *εἶπον*. Well and good. But are we to say *ἐγὼ εἶπον* or *εἶπον ἐγώ*? And lo! we encounter at once the question of hiatus, we encounter the question of position, we encounter the question of expressing the subject at all, every one a stylistic problem.¹

Our grammars tell us that the subject need not be expressed, nay, is not expressed unless it is emphatic; but it is expressed, needlessly expressed, expressed where we can feel no special emphasis. The verbs of these subjects have a certain range; they are very often verbs of saying, thinking, knowing, and with these verbs the first person is very often expressed where we do not feel the need. This assertion of personality in *ἐγφῶδα*, in *ἐγφῶμαι*, is a clue to the tone. The same phenomenon is set down as vulgar in Latin. It is to a certain extent vulgar in Greek, and we are not surprised that the vulgarian Aischines is given to an undue use of the personal pronoun outside of the consecrated range. Is it not 'better form' in our own world to suppress 'I' in favor of the colorless 'one,' in favor of the impersonal passive?

One of the first sections in syntax is the use of the copula. Of course, we are promptly told that the copula is often dispensed with, as in *μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν*, *ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ* and all the other wise saws that we quote, but do not practise. Strictly speaking, we might turn the statement round. The verb which serves as a flux—*εἰμί*—was originally something more than a flux, shows itself, if half a chance be given it, much more than a flux. Two words put side by side will work out the problem of predicate and subject. The old will be the subject, the new will be the predicate, or they will be subject and predicate in turn. We cannot help asking the stylistic meaning of this so-called omission of the copula. Being primal, it belongs to elevated language. Pindar scarcely ever uses the copula, the flux. Being primitive, it is found in proverbial language and proverbial language belongs to the speech of the people. Extremes meet in syntax as in vocabu-

¹ See Ritter, *Untersuchungen über Plato*, p. 90. Cf. A. J. P. VI 489 and X 439 (Hussey).

lary. Our poetical words are often vulgar. Our vulgar words are often poetical. One would like to know more about the omission of the copula than is taught in school grammars.¹ Go a step farther in the same direction. When two substantives are put side by side, one may serve as predicate to the other. Which is which, is extra-linguistic. In Latin juxtaposition must be made to yield the result. There are certain conventionalities, as they are called, in position, *mons summus, summus mons*. In Greek the development of the article serves to distinguish subject from predicate. All this comes naturally from the demonstrative force of the article. The article gives the old notion (*schon da gewesen*), the anarthrous the new. But see how stylistic considerations come into the naïveté of language. At a late period the prefixing of the article here and the omission of it there, were looked upon as a contrivance for avoiding ambiguity, just as in still later times the prefixing of the article was looked upon as a means of indicating gender, τὸ ἄρθρον being practically τὰ ἄρθρα.² Outside of such combinations as οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος, with the article, in which we have the old appositive use, the predicative position of the article, as it is called, involves a certain amount of analysis and it is not impossible that in οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ a later time may have felt οὗτος as the predicate. Another such gnomon of style was recognized by the Greeks themselves in the different attributive positions of the article, adjective and substantive. ὁ ἐμὸς νῖός was to them an illustration of συντομία, ὁ νῖός ὁ ἐμὸς of ὄγκος, and the swell of the latter form was sought after by some of the orators. The third position νῖός ὁ ἐμὸς depends for its interpretation on the grammatical stage of the language. When the article is still largely implicit, when νῖός is ὁ νῖός then νῖός ὁ ἐμὸς = ὁ νῖός ὁ ἐμὸς. When it is explicit, then νῖός ὁ ἐμὸς has a decidedly naïve effect, the after-thought ὁ ἐμὸς is a *grata neglegentia*, a slipshod-diness of the Greeks, and we are not surprised to find it so often

¹ See now Bishop on the omission of the copula with -τέον, A. J. P. XX 248, and Delbrück, Vergl. S. III 121. Worse than useless is such a note as Campbell's on Plato, Theaet. 143 E: 'The adjective receives greater emphasis by the omission of the substantive verb.' It is an explanation that fails to explain.

² Theon προλεγμ. II 83 Sp.: προσθῆσει ἄρθρων οὐκ ἐτι ἀμφίβολος γίνεται ἡ λέξις. In old-fashioned grammars of Latin *hic, haec, hoc* served as substitutes for ὁ, ἡ, τό. Every one will remember the Latin lesson in the Merry Wives of Windsor: 'Articles are borrowed of the pronoun and be thus declined, *singulariter, nominativo, hic, haec, hoc.*'

in Herodotos.¹ But this is only one of the manifestations of the article that cannot be studied grammatically without being studied stylistically. Beginning as a demonstrative pronoun, the article never loses its demonstrative force, but its sphere and its range are different at different times and in different authors. The Homeric use is an adumbration of what it is to be, but the epic use is not the lyric use, the lyric use is not the dramatic use. Compare the chorus of the drama with the dialogue. Compare comic poetry with tragic. The article with proper names has in it a history of styles from the universal omission in the epic to the universal employment in the late Homeric paraphrast.² The orators are bound as the historians are not, and among themselves the orators, vary according to their regard for the conventionalities. But I must not let my illustrations outgrow my thesis, which after all no one will think it worth while to controvert. Every Greek syntax is more or less a *syntaxis ornata*, and if I shall be able to extend the domain of this *syntaxis ornata*, I shall be more than satisfied.

The facts are doubtless more or less familiar and my only hope is that the grouping of the facts and the presentation of the facts may be of service to those who have not made a special study of the relations of grammar and style. Nor need there be any dread lest the necessary analysis destroy the feeling for language. Feeling for language is not destroyed by multiplied observations of this sort. Nay, it is but heightened. The reasoned observation passes over into the unreasoned perception. The mere literary student of style may be able to pronounce with Cicero's man that this verse is by Plautus, this not³, but the scientific student of literature has other and more certain tests. After a while the application of these tests becomes so instinctive that the process is not felt, and when the rhetorician tells the grammarian that this piece of Lysias and that piece of Demosthenes are indistinguishable,⁴ the grammarian feels an array of differences as immediately as if he had not learned those differences by analysis.

¹ See Aristotle's Rhetoric III c. 2, and my comments on his example τῆς ἡμετέρας γυναικός A. J. P. XX 459, which must not be taken too seriously. To the examples of *pluralis maiestatis* there given, add Eur. El. 34: ἡμῖν δὲ δὴ διδωσιν Ἡλέκτραν ἔχειν | δάμαρτα. On the slipshod position see Justin Martyr Apol. I, 6, 7; A. J. P. VI 262 where I correct my statement as to Lucian, and XVII, 126, 518; and Milden's dissertation on the Limits of the Predicative Position in Greek, p. 10.

² A. J. P. XI 483.

³ Cic. Fam. IX 16, 4.

⁴ Dion. Hal., Dem. 992 R.

PARTS OF SPEECH.

There is a queer little book by Spangenberg (A. J. P. VIII 255), if indeed it be by Spangenberg,¹ in which the Nouns under their king *Poeta* make war on the Verbs under their King *Amo*. Spangenberg's—or rather Guarna's—jest becomes earnest with us and we also have to recognize a certain rivalry between the two in the matter of aesthetic syntax. Hermogenes, a famous rhetorician, gives us to understand that the use of the noun gives a certain dignity to style² and a practical illustration of this even in English is furnished by a comparison of the style of Johnson, and the style of Addison as was pointed out long ago. See my *Essays and Studies* p. 155. Whence this dignity? The meaning of the noun is more implicit than that of the verb. The noun wraps itself up, as it were, in its mantle with an air of reserve and whereas the finite verb reveals its voice, its mood, its tense, its person, the abstract noun lets you divine all this. Noun and verb are twins, but not more unlike were Esau and Jacob, Esau, the outspoken and Jacob, the supplanter. Each of these twins has its advantages, the noun in compactness, the verb in directness. But the lively Greek is not content with one advantage at a time—*ἀ ὁ τὸν βάλανον τὸν μὲν ἔχει τὸν δ' ἔραται λαβεῖν*—and impatient of reserve introduces the articular infinitive to do the office of both noun and verb. Introduces it, for the articular infinitive seems to have belonged originally to the realm of vulgar speech, to the realm of eating and drinking—*τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ πειν*. It is not allowed to figure in the aristocratic epic, for in nothing does Parmenides show more plainly his indifference to style than in the use of the articular infinitive in the hexameter. It appears, though rarely, in the lyric, which will not be bound by conventionalities. Fiery Alkaios will cry out:

τὸ γὰρ

*Ἀρεὺ καθάνην κάλον

and lofty Pindar will deign to say:

τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ πρῶτον ἀέθλων.

¹ See Fleckeisen's *Jahrb.* Bd. 154 (1896), p. 443, and a long article by L. Fränkl in *Z.f. vergl. Littg.* XIII, 242, which goes to show that the author is Andreas Guarna Salernitanus. The book was published at Strassburg 1512.

² Classen, *Einleitung zu Thuk.* LXXVI, A. J. P. VIII 333, XVI 525, XX, 111 and now my *Greek Syntax* §§ 61, 141.

But for all that, the articular infinitive is a tribune of the people, a representative of the wants and wishes of the mobile verb. To be sure, it may be said that the infinitive was an abstract noun, to begin with, but it had become the drudge in the family of the verbs and it had served as a substitute for every mood. The patrician Claudius had become the plebeian Clodius and at first τὸ θανεῖν could hardly have been more dignified than τὸ θρέττε. But the promotion of the infinitive and its free association with abstract nouns on a footing of equality gave it something of the σεμνότης of its companions and yet the σεμνότης is a false σεμνότης and there is an ἀπειροκαλία about it at times that reminds one of the market-place. The free use of the articular infinitive in narrative, the free use of the articular infinitive, where the regularly developed verbal noun will serve, are notes of a vulgar style, such as that of Polybios,¹ just as in English 'nonce-nouns' made of infinitives are all vulgar. 'It is my shoot', 'it is my try' are forcible enough and 'shoot' and 'try' have the same advantage over 'shot' and 'trial' that the articular infinitive has over the verbal noun, but I should think long before using in a serious composition Browning's 'He thinks many a long think'.

To the ancient grammarians the infinitive was not a distinct part of speech. τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον was only a manifestation of the verb, though they might have made it a part of speech with the same right as they made the participle, the μετοχή, a part of speech. Nor did the ancient rhetoricians have much to say about the stylistic effect of the infinitive. But in the participle they did recognize a potent element of style, as I have already set forth at length (A. J. P. IX 137), and well they might. The participle adds color and sweep to description. The color sometimes becomes confusing, the sweep sometimes becomes a tangle, but an ametoichic discourse would lack fluency, would lack light and shade. In Greek the participle is idiomatically used where few languages dare follow. So of two imperatives, one is subordinated and our English resents. There is a variant in Matt. 9, 6, that tells the story. ἔγειρε ἄρὸν σου τὴν κλίνην is the Semitic of ἐγερθεὶς ἄρον. It is ἔγειρε ἄρον in Mark 2, 11. In Luke 5, 24, however, it is ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινιδιόν σου πορεύου. Nay, the subordination of the participle with the imperative is common enough in the N. T. The great command is: πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε

¹ See Hewlett, A. J. P. XI 287.

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. But in the narrative even the Greek of the N. T. does not neglect the participle. It could not be Greek at all if it did, and so the Evangelist goes on to say ἐγερθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν where in English we say, 'He arose and departed.'

But the Greek participle did not achieve all its triumphs at once. It has a history. The logical elements which we dissect out of the participle when we call it causal, adversative, conditional, final, all these lay undifferentiated in its original plastic use. This original plastic use is felt throughout the language. This is the use that manifests itself after verbs of perception, for after verbs of actual perception, the participle must be used and no periphrasis will take its place (A. J. P. XIV 374). This is the use that manifests itself in those combinations in which we say that the participle is used *instead* of a substantive, such as αἱμ' ἡελίφ ἀνιόντι, where the translation by an abstract noun destroys the concreteness of the expression.¹ The participle, to begin with, is an adjective but it has more movement than an adjective. The temporal significance is a part of its being. If it loses that temporal significance it is degraded to an adjective, to a noun. If the adjective gains temporal significance it is elevated to the rank of a participle and may take the construction of a participle.² Now it is out of that temporal significance that the familiar categories of cause and condition arose; it is in this way that the participle came to be regarded as an abridged sentence, if one may use the somewhat dangerous phraseology of our grammars. But was there to the Greek himself any consciousness of the participial sentence as an abridged sentence? The Greek rhetoricians give us samples of shifting expression which show consciousness, but their evidence has to be taken with considerable caution and our best guide is the usage of the classic authors. When an author uses a conditional sentence in one member of an antithesis and a participle in the other we can hardly deny the full consciousness of a conditional participle.³ But the conditional participle as such could

¹ For English examples, see Kellner, Historical Outlines of English Syntax, p. 263, and cf. A. J. P. XIX 463, XX 353.

² Cf. Pind. O. 9, 2: φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπία where one of Pindar's unfortunate commentators wishes to 'emend.' Comp. Ion fr. 1, 7 (Bgk.), where the same word is construed as a participle, παῖδες φωνήεντες, ὅταν πέσῃ ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλω, | πρὶν δὲ σιωπῶσιν.

³ E. g. Hdt. 1, 187: ἦν σπανίση—μὴ σπανίσας.

not have come at once, because a conditional participle requires the negative $\mu\eta$ and the negative $\mu\eta$ with the participle is a comparatively late achievement.¹ As we can watch the timid introduction of $\alpha\upsilon$ with inf. to match $\alpha\upsilon$ with opt. in *oratio recta*,² so we can watch $\mu\eta$ stealing into the participial sentence. Once established there, $\mu\eta$ extends its empire as by divine right, and this 'generic' use of $\mu\eta$ of which so much is made in the grammars is nothing but a transfer from the conditional sentence as abridged in the participle. The conditional sentence itself goes back to the imperative, goes back to the optative meaning of $\mu\eta$, and it is no longer necessary to divide the body of $\mu\eta$ and to recognize in it two distinct uses, as is practically done by some, openly by others.³

When $\mu\eta$ is first used with the participle it is used only in consequence of the general requirements of the sentence. There is, strictly speaking, no $\mu\eta$ with the participle in Homer.⁴ When we find it again $\mu\eta$ with the participle distinctly echoes the $\mu\eta$ of an equivalent finite construction. And the articular participle with $\mu\eta$ is a condensed form of the conditional relative. The naïveté of the language is over in Pindar's $\delta \mu\eta \sigma\upsilon\nu\iota\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (N. 4, 31) as it is over in Pindar's $\alpha\gamma\gamma\omega\mu\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon \tau\omicron \mu\eta \pi\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ (O. 8, 61). The participle, then, expresses concretely relations that would be expressed logically by the finite verb; and the use of the finite verb for the participle or the participle for the finite verb produces a stylistic effect which the ancient rhetoricians recognized distinctly.⁵ But participle in Homer and participle in Isaïos are not the same thing. In Homer involution precedes evolution; in Isaïos evolution precedes involution. It is evening primrose against umbrella. In the one

¹ All these points have been worked out since the date of these remarks in two Johns Hopkins dissertations, Gallaway, On the use of $\mu\eta$ with the Participle, and Bolling, On the Participle in Hesiod.

² Il. 9, 684—Comp. v. 417.

³ Cook-Wilson says, 'whatever the common ultimate ancestry of the two meanings of $\mu\eta$, they are as distinct uses as if they were represented by different words.' See A. J. P. XII 520.

⁴ A. J. P. XVIII 244, 369. Remarkable is the steadiness of epic syntax even among imitators. See C. J. Goodwin on Apollonius Rhodius. As to the special instance Ap. Rh. 2, 209 $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon \tau\iota\varsigma \epsilon\tau\lambda\eta | \mu\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\alpha\nu\kappa\alpha\nu\iota\eta\nu \delta\epsilon \phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon | \epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\omega\varsigma$, that is not a true example of $\mu\eta$ with the participle. It is an elliptical figure like $\mu\eta \delta\tau\iota$, but that also is alien from epic poetry. But see now G. M. Bolling, The Participle in Apollonius Rhodius (Studies in Honor of B. L. G., p. 462).

⁵ Dion. Hal., Iud. de Isaëo, 598 R.; Pindar I. E. cix; A. J. P. IX 142.

case the bud has not opened. In the other the umbrella has been folded. As a verb, the participle encroaches on the verb; as an adjective, it encroaches on the adverb. Here again we have concreteness instead of analysis. Conspicuous is the well-known coincidental use of the participle in that construction in which finite verb and participle are reversible, such as the early use of *φθάνω* and *λανθάνω*, as the later use of *τυγχάνω*.¹ For *λανθάνω* the Greek can use *λάθρα*, for *τυγχάνω* he can use *τύχη*, for *φθάνω* he can use the prefix *προ-*, but what a difference in feeling and color; what a difference in feeling and color in the like use of the adjective, *λαθραῖος* for *λάθρα*, *σκοταῖος* or *σκότιος* for *ἐν σκότῳ*, 'darkling' for 'in the dark,' and the rest of the *-ιος* forms. The manner of the action becomes the characteristic of the agent and in some of the combinations we are not far from the concrete Hebrew. (See Pindar xci note.)² *πεμπταῖος* is 'the son of the fifth day' or as the Hebrew has it, the son of five days, just as *κλεινίειος* is the son of *κλεινίας*. Like the English 'son' in proper names, the feeling may be dulled somewhat but it can always be sharpened. The Jewish Mendelssohn thrusts itself on us by sheer bulk, but 'son' and 'sen' are not dead nor is *-ιος* dead. In some of the dialects it is the regular patronymic instead of the genitive. In Attic it is used with the feeling that reminds one of Fitz or Ap before names that are wont to take the Anglo-Saxon 'son.' *κλεινίειος* used of Alkibiades is like 'Fitz-Smith' or 'Ap-Smith' for 'Smithson.' But not to enlarge on this point which brings us into perilous proximity to the genitive, there is evidently a greater naïveté, a greater inliness in this use of the adjective for the adverb, *λαθραῖος* for *λάθρα*, *νύχιος* for *ἐν νυκτί*, and a grammatical category becomes a norm of style.

Indeed, every metastasis of the parts of speech is full of stylistic meaning. So the shift from preposition to adverb, from adverb to preposition. Preposition and adverb belong ultimately to the same category. But in Greek the preposition is sharply differentiated from the ordinary adverb by the facility with which it forms those loose compounds, which to the Greek are *παράθετα* rather than *σύνθετα*. Only in a few instances do preposition and verb grow together and form a corporeal unity. The augment and the reduplication come between verb and preposition. There is

¹ A. J. P. XII 76.

² Plat. Rpb. 614 B: *δωδεκαταῖος ἐπὶ τῇ πυρρῇ κείμενος ἀνεβίω.*

no marriage, only a 'hand-fasting,' as the Scotch say. The Greek will not submit to more, and submits to this only with the preposition. The pseudo-prepositions may disport themselves with the cases, *ἀμα* may take the dative and *ἐνεκα* the genitive but a false Smerdis, if not the only one,¹ on the list of prepositions proper is *σύν*. Now the growth of this relation between the verb and the preposition we can divine from what the written language reveals. We can see how habit brings about love (*consuetudo concinnat amorem*)—how the independence of the prepositional adverb gives way to the seduction of the verb. The preposition as an independent adverb still exists in prose—but only in a few specimens. Even in poetry we feel more than we do in the case of the non-prepositional adverbs that where the preposition is, the mate cannot be far off. Hence the phenomenon is called tmesis, for union having become a second nature, non-union is construed as a divorce, and it is not necessary to speak of tmesis as the 'so-called' tmesis. Everyone can watch the growth of these alliances in certain verbs; everyone feels the difference between the adverbial state and the prefix state. 'Stretched out' and 'outstretched' are not the same even to us, nor 'fill up' and 'upfill'.² But it might be forcing the matter to attach too much importance to the stray prepositions that are still used as adverbs in Greek prose. It is a phraseological survival, an old tradition; and this maintenance of tradition lends raciness to style, makes it idiomatic. A style that abounds in idioms abounds also in traditions, abounds in those unreasoned survivals so precious to the student of language as language, not less precious to the student of language as art.

To the same sphere belongs the shifting use of the prepositions now in composition, now with their cases, now with both. The repetition of the preposition or the use of its synonyms with the case shows a desire to bring out the plastic character of the preposition which is apt to become effaced in the compound, and a large use of such repetitions is stylistically significant. In the earlier language it might be set down to the native desire for reduplication. But in the later language it would seem to show a

¹ Brugmann puts *διά* in the same category, Gr. Gr.³, p. 453, as Professor Miller kindly reminds me.

² Shakespeare, R. & J., I 3: 'I must upfill this osier cage of ours | With baleful weeds'; not to cite examples in which the sense is wholly different, as 'run out' and 'outrun.'

conscious desire to be plastic, a would-be naïveté of style. But it would be premature to formulate in this direction, for in spite of recent labors, there remains much to be done in the whole field of prepositions and prepositional combinations, and those who come after us will have to blush for Greek scholarship as we have to blush when we think that the sphere of *σύν* was not delimited until less than thirty years ago, though, it would seem, any novice might have been struck by the range of citation in the ordinary lexicons.¹ And now that one knows what one knows about *σύν*—which is by no means everything—one is apt to speak as if *σύν* had dropped out of the language, and yet the practical death of *σύν* as a preposition did not affect its life as a prefix, so that it can arise and shine as a preposition in later Greek. Xenophon, it is true, may have something to do with this rehabilitation, as Xenophon is accountable for a variety of revivals in later Greek, but Xenophon alone would not have sufficed.

In estimating, therefore, the frequency of prepositions as a norm of style it is necessary to consider both elements of the preposition, the preposition which takes a case, the preposition which serves as a prefix. A simple enumeration of the prepositions will not serve and *ὀλιγοπροθεσία*, *πολυπροθεσία* cannot be based, as Mommsen has based them, on what we may call for brevity's sake the ptotic preposition. Still the variation in the number of these ptotic prepositions is not without its interest, not without its significance. The writer who has to do with the practical realm of things in the outer world must perforce use a large number and great variety of prepositions, as we can see in the narratives of the orators. In the earlier language we should expect the local signification of the cases to be more sharply felt and the use of the ptotic prepositions to be less imperative. But no matter how far back we go, the preposition is needed for the plastic, the concrete in style. The early poet does, it is true, make free use of the dative as a where case, not so free use of the genitive as a whence case, but the accusative as a whither case is reduced to narrow limits and we must not exaggerate this locative use. And even if the figures show *ὀλιγοπροθεσία* as they do in Pindar, the prepositions must be weighed, not counted merely. Pindar's use of the prepositions

¹ In my Pape of 1849, my constant companion for many years, one reads, 'Homer u. Folgende überall,' and yet outside of Xenophon he cites only two passages, both from Plato, one from the Laws. And this is the kind of work that was accepted in my youth as respectable.

is extremely effective and may be set down as a *gnomon* of his style (Pindar I. E. xli, xcvi foll.). But it is not Pindar, it is the tragic poets that outdo early Greek in their locative use of the cases; and this is one of the marks of conscious antiquarianism in the drama that must not be lost sight of in making up the verdict on this manifestation of antique art. No one can study vocabulary or syntax historically without a serious reduction of the *naïf* in his estimates. Much is conscious effort that is set down to native impulse. But if our enjoyment is not to be marred by all this reflexion and all this analysis we must remember that the technique soon ceases to be conscious, that the burin becomes part of the engraver's hand. Not to cite the long vindication of analysis in art given by Dionysios (Dem. 1113 R. foll.), we may simply say with Euenos:

φημι πολυχρονὴν μελέτην ἔμεναι φίλε καὶ δὴ
ταύτην ἀνθρώποισι τελευτῶσαν φύσιν εἶναι.

THE CASES.

From the consideration of the stylistic effect of a shift in the parts of speech we next approach the stylistic effect of a shift in the cases and here we encounter a number of delicate problems that need the application of those precise methods which so many despise. There is a sad if not a dreary lack of statistical and other material. We have dissertations without number on the use of such and such a case in such and such an author but, so far as I am aware, there has been no research into the average frequency of the occurrence of the several cases and no study of the conditions of the varying proportions. And yet vowels and consonants have been counted and that not merely for purposes of phonetic analysis. In our English type-cases the *e*-box is the largest of all. But even in advance of exhaustive investigation it would be safe to say that there must be a different normal use of the nominative in different languages, that there must be a different individual use of the nominative in different authors. Two authors, for instance, might be differentiated by their respective use of the nominative of abstract nouns. The nominative implies person or personification (A. J. P. XX 111). That is the reason why the neuter has no nominative and the free personification of abstract nouns would be foreign to a simple, practical prose style, would be native to

poetry, to philosophy.¹ Much can be learned from a dry Index verborum. To be sure, one cannot take the nominative alone as, indeed, few phenomena of language can be considered alone. So, for instance, the range of the nominative and the range of the passive cannot be wholly dissociated. Some languages have an aversion to the passive. So the whole Germanic group. But in English the repugnance has been overcome by early translation from languages that use the passive freely and by close contact with Romance syntax, and we use the passive with the utmost readiness, nay, the English language is notoriously passive-loving.² It is a φιλυπτιωτάτη διάλεκτος, as one might say, and goes beyond its models. And this freedom in the use of the passive is furthered by the degradation of the cases, which enables us to turn the active into the passive as readily as does the Greek, nay, more readily. But when we compare Greek with Latin we see the difference. In Latin the dative is not turned into a nominative with the passive as in Greek, but recourse is had to an impersonal passive and φθονοῦμαι becomes *mihi invidetur*. This use of the impersonal, of the dative, carries with it a certain legal particularity of tone, which is in perfect accordance with the character of the Latin language. When the Latin language violates its rule we feel that it is off on a frolic with the Greek. At the same time it will be noticed that the Greek is much more shy of turning its so-called intransitives into impersonal passives. φθονεῖται μοι would be worse than *invideor*. The shyness of Greek is not as the shyness of Latin. Greek will not give up the life of its person, Latin will not give up the exactness of its case. But the characteristics of different languages as based on the relative frequency of their use of the nominative must await more detailed investigation; and it may suffice for the present to note that the effect of the free use of the nominative in Greek has not escaped the observation of the Greek rhetoricians. Ὁρθότης, or the use of the nominative and the finite verb, was to them a note of simplicity. (See A. J. P. IX 141.) This is the

¹ See A. J. P. X 37.

² 'The use of the passive is much more extensive in English than in French, as, in fact, in any language ancient or modern.' See Mätzner Engl. Gr.³, I 344. Super-Weil, On the Order of Words, p. 50. 'In Old English only transitive verbs could be used in the passive. 'We still hesitate over and try to evade such passive constructions as "she was given a watch," "he was granted an audience," because we still feel that *she* and *he* are in the dative, not the accusative relation.' Sweet, N. E. Gr. § 2312.

way in which stories have been told from time immemorial. This is the way in which fables begin. This is the way in which Lysias regularly opens his *narratio*. (A. J. P. IX 142 n.) But simplicity may be overdone. When we rise to a higher sphere like that of tragedy the fabulistic style is felt to be inappropriate and as early a critic as Aristophanes assailed Euripides for the mechanical uniformity of his prologues, which allowed the comic muse to 'hang a calf-skin on the recreant limbs' of tragedy, to substitute a dish-clout for the sable pall of Melpomene and to make *ληκύθειον ἀπώλεσεν* an immortal gibe.¹ The grand manner of Demosthenes avoids rather than seeks a nominative opening and what is called technically *πλαγιασμός* takes its place. That master of forensic chess disdains the ordinary gambit.

Nominative and accusative are the two poles of the explicit sentence, they are the two poles of the implicit sentence, the finite verb. *φονεύω* involves *ὁ φονεύς*, it involves also *τὸν φόνον*. No *λόγος* without the two. But there is a difference which pole is presented, whether we say *ἡ δημοκρατία κατελύθη* (Lys. 13, 4), or *κατέλυσαν τὴν δημοκρατίαν* (cf. § 12), or *τὴν δημοκρατίαν κατέλυσαν*. In translation, it is true, we are perfectly right to sacrifice active to passive or passive to active as the case may be, in order to bring out the emphasis of position, but translation is a poor approximation and should not be allowed to efface, in our minds at least, the native distinctions. The accusative has far more primitive force, has far more passion in it than the nominative, and in all moments of excitement rushes to the head of the sentence, so that this reversal of the poles of the sentence is a mechanical device that cannot be considered a perfect success, and yet if we retain the original order and say 'Him ye have taken', 'This Jesus hath God raised up,' everyone feels that the stress is overdone. This is a problem of perpetual recurrence and has not escaped our grammars, but involving as it does the order of words, it is either passed over lightly or answered by a mechanical formula that satisfies no one. It is, then, by no means a matter of indifference whether we express a thought actively or passively, whether the subject takes the place of the object or not—nay, the rhetoricians tell us that in some circumstances it makes a difference whether we use the nominative with the finite verb or the accusative and the infinitive,² but the distinction which they

¹ Ar. Ran. 1212.

² Theon II 74 Sp.

make is hardly a grammatical one. It simply amounts to saying that with the accusative and infinitive one shirks the responsibility and is therefore more modest.

OBLIQUE CASES.

The rivalry of nominative and accusative, though fairly recognized, is commonly relegated to the unsatisfactory category of emphasis, and so dismissed, but the real point, the rivalry between the oblique cases will not down and makes it hard to sit in the seat of those who are scornful of petty grammatical distinctions.

No grammar can escape the registry of these rival uses and a certain differentiation is demanded. When two cases have the same form, as dative and locative in Greek or as many datives and ablatives in Latin, how are we to tell which case is meant? Ordinarily in Latin the problem is simple enough, but sometimes it cannot be solved by grammatical tests. Sometimes the only test is the author's way of looking at things, just the same test that we apply to vocabulary in case of verbs, just as we say that in Pindar P. 2, 62: ἀναβάσσομαι στόλον, it is more poetical¹ and consequently more Pindaric to take στόλον in the sense of 'prow' than in the sense of 'voyage' as a cognate accusative to ἀναβάσσομαι, just as Mr. Pater translates *carrière ouverte* 'an open quarry' whereas ninety-nine hundredths of ordinary mortals would translate it 'open lists' or mayhap 'open career.'²

To take a Latin instance, if both dative and ablative are permissible, the choice will be determined by the way in which the author is wont to personify. But the problem of choice between ablative and dative is complicated by the fact that the ablative itself is a mixed case. To discover this was not reserved for our day. It was pointed out by Quintilian, who says that there is a certain natural amphiboly in the ablative and gives a concrete instance which he quotes from memory and misquotes, *caelo decurrit aperto*.³ Is *caelo aperto* local, is it circumstantial? So,

¹ See Jebb on Soph. Philoct. 343.

² Plato and Platonism, p. 96: 'We . . . will bring you like some perfectly accomplished implement to this *carrière ouverte*, this open quarry, for the furtherance of your personal interests in the world.' Needless to say, this is a little joke of Mr. Pater's like Plato's use of ἄλοχος (Theaet. 149 B). ἄλοχος, by the way, reminds me of Buchholz's κουρίδιος ἄλοχος (II 2, 7) and the painful necessity of learning some elementary things before one ventures on 'Homerische Realien.'

³ Cf. Quint. I. O. I. 4, 26; 7, 9, 10.

modern commentators have asked if in *assiduo ruptae lectore columnae* the ablative *assiduo lectore* is instrumental or circumstantial. To me it is as instrumental as the famous *lassata viris* is instrumental but I recognize the right of private judgment and there are many instances in which the decision may fairly be in suspense. The dative is a mixed case; in Greek clearly so. Now the choice between the different elements of this mixed case in a given instance must be determined in large measure by the aesthetic character of the author and the department. Shall we have the cold local dative or the warm personal dative?¹ These are problems with which the personal equation of the investigator must interfere to a considerable extent. It is easier to reduce *dare* to a mere verb of motion in Latin than it is to perform the same office for *δοῦναι* in Greek,² but at the same time it is harder to depersonalize the dative in Latin than to depersonalize the dative in Greek. These are undoubtedly perplexing problems. Evidently we have to be guided by extra-grammatical considerations, so that while we are trying to frame a code of aesthetics out of grammar, we have to construct a grammatical code out of aesthetics. As Quintilian puts the problem, we should have to consider the extent to which the author and the period use the ablative of manner, the ablative of time, which has become the ablative absolute, and the locative ablative before we can decide a simple point of grammar. The mixed cases once thoroughly mixed must have lain to a certain extent undifferentiated in the consciousness of the users of the language, and to decide when this or that element is dormant, when it is awake and at work, is no easy matter and this universal difficulty is further complicated by the character of period, department, individual.

More tangible seems to be the problem when different cases are permissible and when there can be no question as to the form, as when we find the genitive of the owner and the dative of the possessor side by side, as when certain adjectives oscillate between dative and genitive. Yet even these differences are not to be measured by any mechanical rule. What an interval,

¹ See Pind. O. 2, 90; I. E. xciii; Thompson on Phaedr. 254 E.; A. J. P. VIII 253, 254; Conington on Verg. Aen. 10, 681.

² To the examples of *δοῦναι* with dat. before cited I beg to add Sim. Amorg. 7, 54: τὸν δ' ἄνδρα τὸν παρόντα νανσίη διδοί. Eur. Bacch. 621: χεῖλεσιν διδόνς δόδοντας 'letting his lips have his teeth'. Eur. Tro. 96: ἐρημία δούς (cf. 'leaves the world to darkness and to me'). Plat. Rpb. 566 C: θανάτῳ διδοται.

for instance, separates the fine ethical use of the pronoun from the coarse σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον with its ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Indeed, so crude is this ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ that we can hardly believe the traditional example, for Greek normally uses the genitive with parts of the body. So crude is it that we are tempted to call it negro-Greek as *maitre à moi* is negro-French. It may be hard to follow the finer lines of differentiation, and I myself have said (I. E. xciv), "There is a certain caprice in these matters that it is not profitable to pursue," but psychologists have made a special study of the knee-jerk¹ and the nimble capers of language must be followed up. There is clearly something more *naïf*, more dramatic about the dative than there is about the genitive. *θυγάτηρ οἱ* (Pind. O. 9, 16) is 'daughter to her' not 'her daughter'² and it would not be exaggeration to say that the encroachment of the dative on the genitive with adverbs and adjectives which we notice in certain authors shows a tendency to emphasize the personal relation; and assuredly this is a characteristic of style. It is the story of the genie. The dative releases the verbal element of the adjective which was shut up in the casket of the genitive. *φίλος* as a substantive takes the genitive, as an adjective it takes the dative.³

¹ See W. P. Lombard, Variations of the normal knee-jerk, *Am. Journal of Psychology* I, p. 5, 1888.

² To be sure, *οἱ* is now considered by some a virtual genitive and not a dative and Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.*³ p. 393, says that it is false to make the dative sense basic (vom dativischen Sinn auszugehen), as Dyroff and Kühner-Gerth have done. But that is not the last word on the subject, unless I am very much mistaken. That *οἱ* was a dative to the Greek feeling seems to be as plain as anything can be. See my note on the chiasitic use of genitive and dative, Pind. O. 6, 5. And it is with the Greek feeling that I have mainly to do in my researches. How far comparative grammar helps to that end is a subject not to be discussed in a footnote. 'Das drama,' says Wilamowitz (H. F. 626), 'drückt in der anrede das possessive verhältnis bei verwandtschaftswörtern durch den dativ aus, *θυγάτηρ μοι, τέκνον μοι, γύναι μοι.*' Does this mean the effacement of the difference between the dative of the possessor and the genitive of the owner (cf. Plato, *Theaet.* 197 B), or is it simply one of the many devices that remind us how far the language of the stage was from *naïveté*?

³ Of course, here also Delbrück and Brugmann have turned themselves and with themselves the grammatical world upside down, and I venture to heave again the sigh of which I delivered myself in my Chicago address of 1901: 'I must confess that I am in mourning because of the genitive and expect to go mourning all my days because of the genitive. In fact, I am tempted in dark hours to curse the genitive and die, or at any rate to say with Dame

πλησίον which normally takes the genitive, occasionally rebels against normality and the late ἐγγύς with the dative is a revolt of the living person against the dead place. The story of *par* in Latin is also instructive and the struggle of *plenus* to get rid of the genitive is not without significance. Verbs of touching in Pindar may take the dative. Is not this a part of his aloofness like the discarding of ἵνα and the espousal of ὄφρα? In fact all the shifts of the cases have meaning. So, for instance, in the κατά- compounds, so many of which take the genitive, while καταρᾶσθαι takes the dative, as does καταγελᾶν in Herodotos to Cobet's intense disgust,¹ and κατακρίνειν follows κρίνειν. The anaconda, analogy, swallows and assimilates so much that what has escaped the analogic process may well arrest attention and, in fact, grammarians essay to answer some of these questions. But the answers are often unsatisfactory to the oracles themselves, and the full significance, the sharp characteristics cannot be formulated without a study of the cases that will have regard to the whole range of the language as well as to departments and individuals.

Not an uninteresting chapter in the rivalries of the cases is the story of the absolute uses. All the Greek cases are used absolutely. The vocative, of course. The nominative when used alone is a sentence in itself and cannot get rid of its implied verbal function. It is a manifestation of character, if nothing else. And yet at times it tries to be irresponsible, and then we call it a nominative absolute, but it is at best a *nominativus pendens*, it is a functionary that is awaiting its function. We find the phenomena at one end in the οἰδόφρων πέτρα that we call Aischylos, we find it at the other in the shallow feuilletonist Philostratos, but how different the tone, how different the

Quickly: "Vengeance of Jenny's case! Fie on her! Never name her!" The fact is, the genitive, the Greek genitive, seems to have gone wrong and I find it hard to accommodate myself to the reversal of the old views on the subject of that beautifully blended case. Theoretically I know how much a landscape gains by being viewed head down, and the regimen of the genitive is doubtless much more beautiful when you set the old theory on end, but when one is not only stiff in one's intellectual joints but has worn the academic and epicene attire of a professor for a few scores of years, the operation is not so easy as when one was more limber in his structure and had the freedom of bifurcated garments.'

¹ N. L. 97.

sphere. Three other cases enter the race—accusative, dative, genitive. The accusative gains a footing though comparatively late, the dative never wholly succeeds, never wholly fails, but the genitive becomes the absolute case by eminence. It might be not an altogether idle speculation to inquire why different languages have chosen this or that case for their absolute case, but for us it is of immediate importance to consider what is peculiar to Greek in the evolution of the genitive absolute and the significance of the evolution. Of course, everyone knows that the genitive absolute is not strictly absolute, but at the same time everyone feels the exceptional position and that is enough. I have been taken to task more than once for the use of figurative language in the domain of grammar, and one of my critics has been offended at my comparison of the genitive absolute with Milton's 'tawny lion pawing to get freed his hinder parts' (Pind. O. 6, 3). He says that nothing is gained by it. Perhaps not. But few scholars like any figures except their own, and for that matter critics have found fault with Milton's pawing lion as well as with my poor comparison. The paws, I need not say, are the participles and the hinder parts are the genitive, and the whole attitude represents the transition from the low relief of the earlier construction to the high relief of the later construction. But the lion is a terror to slothful intellects and possibly an impertinence here. Let us proceed soberly.

The genitive absolute was a gradual evolution. The dependent genitive released itself more and more from definite control until first familiar phrases gained their freedom and then long complexes. We can see the process going forward. The Homeric usage is an old story; the Pindaric usage marks a considerable advance on Homer and yet Pindar is much less free than Attic prose. A genitive that is dependent in Homer and Pindar may be independent in Plato and Demosthenes. The presumption is in favor of dependence in the earlier, of independence in the later writers. And this is a study that leads to another view of the cases, a stylistic view as well as a grammatical view. The cases have different tensile strength, different carrying power. Accusative and nominative can wait long for their regimen. Not so the genitive. If its regimen is to be felt it must be within easy reach and a genitive at the head of a sentence has a tendency to dissociate itself from the rest. Some uses of the genitive are, it is true, more tolerant than others. So

the partitive genitive can wait some time for its parts, but to Homer the distributive apposition is easier—that distributive apposition which is one of the features of Homeric syntax. No statistics are known to me in regard to this carrying power of the cases and evidently there must be a considerable difference in periods, department, individuals; and just as we find that the article has an enormous carrying power in the dactylo-epitrites of Pindar, which it lacks in the logaoedics, so in stately and deliberate language the genitive may carry much farther than in rapid conversation. We can see this by our use of the English equivalent of the genitive. ‘Of man’s first disobedience’ is far enough from ‘Sing, Heavenly Muse,’ to set up an establishment of its own. But our minds are attuned to a more equable movement and we are not impatient. Elsewhere we should treat ‘Of man’s first disobedience’ as if it were the title to a book like Milton’s ‘Of Prelatical Episcopacy’ and we should not think of any regimen. This is what we find true of a number of genitives for which the grammars were good enough to supply *περί* or rather *περὶ*. But there is nothing to supply. The genitive at the head of the sentence without a regimen simply becomes an object of thought. If we must have a prop, let it be the neuter accusative article, let *τοῦ τῆς τοῦ* be *τὸ τοῦ*, *τὸ τῆς*, *τὸ τοῦ*, but no prop is needed.

The personal dative seems to have been almost ready to develop an absolute use and nearly approaches an absolute use in a number of phrases taken from everyday life, *εἰσιόντι, ἀψαμένῳ* and the like, but so sensitive is the dative that it sets up a relation anywhere and so ready is its attachment to any part of the sentence that grammarians are apt to consider it as dependent on the whole sentence rather than on any special word.

PREPOSITIONS.

If we pass from the cases to the prepositions we enter upon a field which has been worked in spots until the ground is pulverized with the statistical harrow, while in parts it lies absolutely fallow. Of polyprothesy and oligoprothesy something has been said already. Of the sphere of the different prepositions it is hardly possible to do more than give some illustrations. Each period, each dialect, each department, has a special register. Every author has his necessities, has his habits, has his

fads. A number of prepositions that parade themselves in our grammars by the side of the working members of prose society are really unpractical creatures, that are found chiefly in poetry, such as ἀμφί and ἀνά. In a recent edition of Pindar there is a long and rather fanciful excursus on ἀνά.¹ ἀνά is a fine old preposition, but it may be said of ἀνά as of Rose Aylmer, 'Ah! what avails the princely race.' ἀνά is dead to the prose of everyday life and κατά reigns in its stead. The large use of ἀνά gives at once an antique hue and we may expect to find it in conscious poetry. ἀμφί, which abounds in Pindar, has given way to περί. Thanks to legal phrases, and to its use by certain popular authors σύν holds on, and in later Greek there is a restoration of σύν, but such a model of deportment as Isokrates is careful to avoid a mixture of styles and no σύν is to be found in his orations. This scrupulous behavior of Isokrates was observed many years ago by Haupt, but it was not until 1874 that Mommsen set the character of σύν in its true light. This separation of prepositions into poetical and universal may, if you choose, be ranked under vocabulary and so escape syntax proper, but the poetical, the dialectic uses of the universal prepositions are assuredly syntactical and as assuredly stylistic. The gradual deadening of ὑπέρ into an equivalent of περί shows only one side of the process of change. In the course of time a preposition may be specialized and take on an atmosphere. So παρά narrows itself in prose to a personal use with genitive and dative. What is largely chez (casa) in prose is simply 'alongside' in poetry and if we transfer the personal connotation to poetry, we shall evidently give too much color, we shall evidently overdo. (Pindar, I. E., c and O. 1, 20.) The distinction, sharp and clear, which runs through prose remorselessly, despite the commentators, between διά with genitive and διά with accusative in a metaphorical sense, is naught in Homer because in Homer there is no διά with genitive, in the sense of a person through whom, and the distinction which is made in Homer, not with perfect assurance, between διά with genitive and διά with accusative in a local sense, falls away in prose which will have nothing to do with διά and the accusative in a local sense, and transfers that duty to the prefix διά so that we must say διαβαίνειν τὸν ποταμόν or διαβαίνειν διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ and there is no διὰ πόντον to compare with διὰ πόντον. ἔξ to an Ionian

¹ J. B. Bury, Isthmian Odes, Appendix H.

cannot have had so much color as it has to the writers of standard prose who differentiate it with more or less care from *ὑπέρ*. Those who change the Thukydean *ἀπὸ* into the normal *ὑπέρ*, those who substitute *ἐν* for *ἐπὶ* with dative (A. J. P. XI 373) are sinning against individual rights which must be scrupulously guarded even if the assertion of those rights amounts, as it does in the case of Thukydides, to perverseness. As to the chapter on the favorite preposition, for which in the range of the Attic orators the industry of Lutz has provided us with ample statistics, we must be on our guard against rapid inference. That nothing is aesthetic that withdraws itself from perception is the baldest of truisms, and yet one must not lose one's footing on it; for perception is relative and figures are not to be despised. Figures serve to confirm impression, figures serve to train powers of observation, but microscopic differences in this direction and that, are of little avail. We must have large masses of phenomena, we must have startling contrasts. If one is told, for instance, that *ἐξ* is a favorite preposition with Isaïos, one remarks languidly that Isaïos had largely to do with inheritance cases and was obliged to use *ἐξ*. One would hardly recognize a stylistic element in the recurrence of 'cubits' in the account of the building of the tabernacle or in the history of the temple. One would not be impressed by 'out of' in a stud book. Somewhat different is the case when we come to Isokrates and his use of *πρός*, but with the shifting exigencies of the world about us, with the large variety of prepositions that we encounter, it is hardly possible to hear any dominant note, and if one begins to hear one note more than another, it is often at the expense of the whole symphony. Hyperaestheticism is even more fatal to enjoyment than the dull content which considers all constructions alike.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.